which I would not do freely in their presence. The Rabbinic principle (p. 87) is undoubtedly valid from an ethical standpoint.

Living, as I do all the time, in apprehension of the waning of Jewish life in America, I try to discover every possible sign which gives some promise of the conservation of that life. I need every such sign as a stifling man needs oxygen. I go to the extent of asking the students in the Graduate School to prepare papers on the various factors of conservation in Jewish life. This year when I read the papers handed in by the students at the end of the second quarter, I was sorry I had given them that assignment, because what they had to say was to me very disheartening. For want of anything really substantial I try to draw nourishment from the few husks like the following: (Israel Levinthal would introduce at this point the story of).

1. Longmans Green & Co. sent me a manuscript by a Rabbi Morris Goldstein (from what Ira tells me, he is probably Israel Goldstein's brother) on the history of the Jewish Religion. I was happy to see that someone has at last written a continuous account of the Jewish religion from its inception down to our own day which can be put into the hands of young people and adults without repelling them. I had been hoping to write such a book, but I am just as glad as if I had written it in spite of the many inadequacies in the treatment of the subject.

2. An address by a Max Simon, president of the Cleveland Community Council, which is published in "Notes and News," issued by the Council of Jewish Federations and Welfare Funds. In that address I can see that the idea of organic community is beginning to take root.

3. Mrs. Abraham Goldberg and a Mr. Israeli came this afternoon to invite me to participate in a function to be tendered to the musician Haberman who is leaving for Palestine April 23. The purpose of this function is to stimulate the efforts being made in this country to establish a musical academy in Palestine, the purpose of which shall be to train virtuosi not only musically but also culturally in a Jewish way. An undertaking of this kind holds out the promise of a modern Jewish music arising in Palestine. The value of such a development for Diaspora Jewry is incalculable.

I have been regaling myself the last few days on Nahum Sokolow's (p.88) [illegible]. By the side of [illegible] whose character sketches I have thus far read, I feel very diminutive. Nonetheless, I drink in avidly all that Sokolow in his exuberant and encyclopedic manner has to say about his heroes. The only thing that prevents my intellectual and spiritual enjoyment from being complete is that I have no one to share it with. I would give anything in the world to have someone to study with, or to read with. I do not like discussion. Before long I find myself either saying the same thing as my interlocutor or talking at cross purposes with him. The result in either case is boring.

* * *

Monday, May 18, 1936

More than the usual exertion of will power is required for me to resume this journal. The inward resistance however is overcome by the momentum of the long established habit to record experiences. That habit gives me no rest until I insert the main items of what has happened since the last recording. The principal reason for the interruption has been that I wanted to use every available moment to get through with the 9000 word article on the Teachers Institute.

That task lay like an incubus on my mind, otherwise I would hardly have gotten through with it within the time set for it. I was so anxious to free myself of it that I had it done almost a week ahead of time. The paper grew to about 11-12 thousand words, and has turned out to be quite readable. Thank God for that.

Sunday, April 26: The Teachers Institute Honor Group met at Dinin's house. I attended the meeting. The topic of discussion was how to implement the Reconstructionist movement. They were rid at last of the pilpulistic discussion of Communism vs. Judaism -- thanks to the absence (or perhaps elimination) of Linfield. I suggested that every member of the Group should lead a Reconstructionist study club or circle in whatever organization he is affiliated with or works for. Dinin offered the countersuggestion that they organize themselves as a Reconstructionist society and do thing. But when he had to make more specific what he meant by doing things he realized that what I had proposed was the only tenable plan. My plan was accepted.

Tuesday, April 28: I then held my last seminar with the Seminary men this year. I had met with them (the twelve of the 3rd and 4th year classes) about six times and discussed with them the first five chapters of the (p. 89) ירקוני לפתן. I had occasion to learn and impart a number of interesting ideas about theology in general and Jewish theology in particular.

Incidentally, I came across in one of Sokolow's articles in Ha-aretz the following statement: (p. 89) ר' נחמן מברסלב הבעיר את הסביבה עם אנשי שלומנו, לרבים אין ספק שהוא היה אחד הצדיקים הגדולים שבדורו. What barbarians the best of these Hasidic rebis could be! After all, Graetz was right in his condemnation and Buber is all wrong in his idealization of the Hasidic movement.

Wednesday, May 6: I took part in the meeting of the Rabbinical Assembly Committee on Law. The meeting took place at Prof. Ginzberg's

home at 3:00 P.M. The subject of discussion was the Agunah problem. The suggested Takanah has raised a storm in Orthodox circles. For some reason, mainly negligence, the Committee had been acting on this matter without having consulted Ginzberg. He resented his being ignored in so vital a question, whereas in the question of wine for sacramental purposes - a question that arose during the prohibition days when many Orthodox rabbis went into the bootlegging business - he had been induced to write a lengthy legal disquisition which was not heeded then and is forgotten now. The absence of Ginzberg's imprimatur exposed the Rabbinical Assembly to a wild attack from the Union of Orthodox Rabbis. Realizing their mistake the Law Committee came to Ginzberg imploring his help. Louis Epstein of Boston is the (p.89) in the committee. Higger, Boaz Cohen, Greenstone and Drob are the other legal minds. Epstein had written a pamphlet defending the Takanah which he had suggested. When in the course of the discussion that pamphlet was mentioned, Ginzberg remarked that he hadn't read it, although he thought highly of Epstein and read everything else Epstein had written. The reason was quite evident. He felt hurt he hadn't been consulted.

Although they decided to go on with the fight to introduce some Takanah that might alleviate the Agunah evil, I doubt whether much good will come out of heir decision. I am convinced that so long as they will try to use the method of legal fiction or any other device in order to remain within the traditional law, they will get nowhere. I ventured to suggest the advisability of Takanah in the sense of legislation, but, of course, no one in Ginzberg's presence would even dare approve of such a procedure.

In the issue before the last one of the Reconstructionist, Ira and I wrote an editorial in reply to Rabbi Leo Jung's attack on

Reconstructionism, which appeared in the Silver Jubilee Volume of the Mizrahi. He came back with a retort the week following in his Center Bulletin.

Sunday, May 10: The SAJ had its annual meeting. Everything went off hunky dory.

Monday, May 11 - Thursday, May 14: I attended the sessions of the Kallah led by Prof. Ginzberg. He gave little more than what he stated on his first set of notes (pp. 1-16) covering the Mishnah of Kiddushim. I am glad I managed to attend, first because I had carried out something I had made up my mind to do in spite of the press of other work. Secondly, because I feel that a man of Ginzberg's ability deserves all the recognition he could get and more. If I had been (?p.90) Evelina I would have gotten Mrs. Miller to contribute the $20,000ø for the publication of Ginzberg's commentaries on the Talmud rather than for Davidson's Thesaurus.

There can be no question that his interpretation of Mishna is infinitely more correct that that of the Amorain. But if that is the case, what becomes of the whole structure of Talmudic law? Is it possible that he hasn't ever asked himself that question? How is it then that he is content to allow the traditional status quo to abide in time of such dire need for change?

Monday, May 11: I spoke at the Synagogue in Peekskill. The Jewish community there is economically quite comfortable. They therefore have time to squabble about religion. The center of the fight is Jacob Grossman who has been officiating as rabbi during this year. He was elected by a majority of one vote. Likewise the president of the congregation. His main work consists in conducting a Hebrew School and leading some adult study groups. In that way he introduced my book "Judaism as a Civilization" and the philosophy it expounds. To clinch his hold on those who follow him he had me come to Peekskill.

It was to me an interesting experience. What effect it will have on his stay there is more than I can tell.

The April 29 issue of the Christian Century carries a savage attack on the interpretation of Judaism as a Civilization. At the editorial meeting of the Reconstructionist we formulated a reply which Steinberg wrote up and which we revised at a subsequent meeting. It was sent to the Christian Century, but they answered that they want Morrison, who had written the editorial in which he assailed me, to reply. But since he is in England at present it will be some time before our letter can be published.

In the meantime some irresponsible scribblers in the Anglo-Jewish press are taking up the defense of Judaism, and the first thing they do is to throw me to the wolves. An anonymous scribbler in the Detroit Jewish Chronicle speaks of my book as a curiosa Judaica which nobody takes seriously. That surely hurts, but it doesn't make me in the least unhappy because I know it's not true.

* * *

Wednesday, May 20, 1936

Yesterday I received a letter from Dr. Adler enclosing a letter he had received from Kalman Whiteman as secretary of the Agudath Ha-Menahelim complaining against the Jewish Teachers Association for [illegible] whose members are for the most part Teachers Institute graduates, for having participated in the May Day Parade which he says was "organized and led principally by the Communists." In view of the attitude of the Communists these days toward the Arab riots in Palestine which they glorify as an expression of a national uprising, Jews who have any sort of national Jewish sentiment should not be deluded by Communist slogan of "a united front." Theoretically, Whiteman and the members of the Agudat Ha-Morim who have been agitating through the

Hadoar and the Jewish Morning Journal for the dismissal of the JTA teachers who marched in the parade, are not altogether wrong. But, realistically, those who are carrying on this agitation have pounced upon this opportunity to oust the teachers whom they regard as their most formidable rivals. This is evident from a Hebrew circular which the Agudat Ha-Morim distributed a week before the May Day Parade. In that circular they berate the JTA for making concessions by the use of English in teaching and by accepting a curriculum of less than 10 hours per week.

* * *

Friday, May 22, 1936

Last night I attended, by invitation, a meeting of the Education Committee of Hadassah, which took place at the home of Israel Brodie, 175 Riverside Drive. Among the others invited were Berkson, Chipkin and Dinin. Mrs. Minnie Halpern, a graduate of the Teachers Institute is chairman of the committee. The meeting was called for the purpose of evaluating the educational work of Hadassah and suggesting further developments. I found the discussion both gratifying and stimulating. Everyone who spoke made reference either to my general approach to Judaism or to the address I delivered a few years ago at a Hadassah convention, and copies of which had been distributed among the Hadassah chapters. That together with the leading part played by Teachers Inst. graduates in Hadassah educational work afforded me deep satisfaction.

The discussion was on a high level and brought out very interesting analyses of what is being done and what should be done. It was, however, only toward the end that Mrs. Edward Jacobs, the national president of Hadassah, indicated the specific purpose for which we were invited to discuss the Hadassah educational program. She wanted to know whether H. should go on, as it has hitherto, depending on

volunteer direction and effort, or should H. expand its program and begin to call in paid workers. She implied in the way she put the question that she was afraid of inaugurating a policy of expansion.

They called upon me last. When I started speaking I had only one thought in mind, and that was to call their attention to the fact that in raising the educational problem as it did Hadassah was entering upon a new stage in its development, and I was going to conclude by simply pointing out to them that they had to make a choice between remaining on the plane of an organization working for Palestine only or evolving into an organization working for the survival and development of Jewish life. But as I was speaking the significance of Mrs. Jacobs' reluctance to expand the educational program dawned on me and I realized that it was not enough for me to define the situation as presenting the possibility of a choice. The very future of Palestine work is in jeopardy at present, because of the challenge of communism. That being the case, the very existence of Hadassah demanded that it enlarge into educational program and set up as its purpose the development of a philosophy of Jewish life that could meet Communism on its own ground. This necessitated an integrated orientation to Judaism and the accession of persons who are qualified by training, ability and wholehearted attention to interpret and transmit such an orientation to ~~km~~ others.

* * *

Wednesday, June 10, 1936

I handed in today to Louis Behrman, the publisher, the material of "The Jewish Reconstructionist Papers," which I edited. The idea of publishing such a collection evolved from a suggestion made by Ben Zion Boxer at one of the meetings of the Reconstructionist Editorial Board about three months ago. His suggestion was that we publish a book of sermons to demonstrate the application of our point of view to preaching. But in the discussion it became apparent that very

people would be interested in reading a collection of sermons. The idea was then sprung, I don't remember by whom, whether by me or by someone else, that we collect the representative papers and editorials that have appeared in our magazine.

I believe the publication of these papers will give Reconstructionism a boost.

At the graduation exercises of the Seminary this year Simon Greenberg in his address carried out the will of the authorities to emphasize that Judaism was nothing but a religion and that the ~~xixx~~ salvation of American Israel will come from the congregational and not the communal school.

* * *

Friday, June 19, 1936

A little over two weeks ago Morris Rothenberg, the president of the ZOA wrote to me inviting me to deliver the address at the next convention on July 5 on the occasion of the tercentennary of the founding of Rhode Island. Although I am generally very reluctant to accept such invitations, I made an exception in this case, for two reasons: 1) because I had promised to participate in the meeting of the Biro-Bidjan committee scheduled for Sunday, June 21and 2) because I thought I would have an opportunity to air the controversy started by the Christian Century in its issue of April 29, and to use the reputed tolerance of Roger Williams as a basis for countering the veiled anti-Semitism of that periodical. Since then both of these reasons have been dissipated.

In view of the present sentiment against cooperating with communists, I felt that I had to offset the wrong impression that might have been created by my participation in the Biro-Bidjan project. But now that the meeting called for June 21 has been postponed that

that reason no longer holds.

Secondly, when I read up on Roger Williams I began to realize that he was anything but a model of tolerance. It is the old story of people insisting in the name of freedom not only upon having their own way but upon the right to meddle in the lives of others. He seems to have had a confused mind and a paradoxical character - a true product of the New Testament ideal, gentle as a dove and wily as a serpent, forgiving to his persecutors and cruel to those who wanted to be let alone. I saw that I would have a hard case trying to make out Williams to have been an apostle of religious tolerance, and a still harder case if I tried to prove that he extended the principle of tolerance to group minorities.. The savage attacks by the "rabbinical" Christians and the "Christian" rabbis (both Orthodox and Reformists) are beginning to wear me out, because I don't see any militancy on the part of those who applaud my version of Judaism. Even more heartbreaking is the new wave of "red" assimilationism which is sweeping over Jewish life. All this took the heart out of my resolve to speak at the next Zionist convention. I therefore withdrew my acceptance, giving as a reason that my doctor advised me to refrain from speaking in public and participating in meetings.

I purposely included in the fib the advice against participating in meetings because I wanted to make it impossible for myself to attend the convention of the Rabbinical Assembly at Tannersville which is scheduled for July 6-8. I am sure that I would have found enough to annoy and upset me yet I was tempted to attend. Now I am armed against that temptation.

Last Wednesday night, Moss, the president of the United Synagogue and Samuel Cohen met with the Editorial Board of the Reconstructionist. This meeting was occasioned by an editorial in the

Reconstructionist in which we not only tried to debunk the United Synagogue, but also urged that it is an important enough institution to be made to function properly.

The outcome of the discussion was that 1) Moss and Cohen promised to urge the making of a survey analogous to that made not long ago by the Union of Hebrew Congregations. This would give everyone an idea what it is that the people identified with the United Synagogue expect from that organization, and how far they would be prepared to accept changes in their life and outlook as Jews. 2) Simultaneously with such a survey a committee consisting of rabbinical laymen would begin to work on a specific platform for the United Synagogue to replace the present one which is too vague to mean anything, and 3) that a monthly be conducted in which not propaganda but controversy be carried on for the purpose of clarifying the problems of Jewish life and religion. I suggested that Eugene Kohn be entrusted with the editorship of such a periodical.

If the foregoing suggestions would actually be carried into effect it would be the first time that the Reconstructionist movement will have fulfilled the purpose I assigned to it in my preface to ~~my~~ the book of Papers which I have recently given to the publisher -- that of changing the quality of the existing Jewish organizations.

* * *

June 22, 1936

Although official contacts with the Seminary authorities, especially Faculty members, usually irritate me and make me want to get away from the Seminary building as far as possible, informal chats with them, which come about through casual meetings make me feel as though I would want to stay around on the premises most of the time. I enjoy exceedingly the physical surroundings of the place. Academic atmosphere is veritable oxygen to me, provided it is accompanied by

congenial exhange of ideas. The following matters came my way and were disposed of today:

1. I talked over with Dinin the question of allocating the $2540 available from the late Levine's salary for TI and Seminary College budget. I needed this talk before meeting Adler to whom I wanted to make a number of suggestions pertaining to the TI budget, yet it came about accidentally merely as a result of my having come into the building.

2. If I had not come then I would have forgotten that when I was there last Friday I had decided to tell the girls in the office not to allow my reports of the TI work and other records to lie around

Tuesday, June 23, 1936

where anybody who went into the office would read them. I also reminded myself to ask Dinin to clean up the storage room of the TI.

3. When I came into the cafeteria I sat down at Louis Finkelstein's table. Before long the dis cussion veered into the problem of communal organization. He expressed the fear that the community, by displacing the existing organizations would become totalitarian in character and come to be dominated by aggressive politicians. Using the parallel of the Federal government he said that it would be as fatal for Jewish life to give up its existing organizations as it would have been for the American government to replace the individual state governments.

The fact is that I have been so much concerned with the federal idea, so to speak, in Jewish life, that I have paid little attention to the question of the autonomy of the constituent groups. To my way of thinking the main problem today is to break down the resistance to integration of all Jewish activities. Finkelstein argues as if everybody accepted the principle of integration, and he already fears its consequences to a degree that leads him to oppose it altogether.

Whether such opposition is motivated by a genuine fear, or is generated by a desire to antagonize, no one can tell, probably not even he himself.

In any event, the discussion with him has led me to call up Behrman's not to proceed with the setting up of my introduction to the Reconstructionist Papers, because I want to insert a paragraph or two to meet the objection he raised.

4. Another interesting encounter was the one I had with Dr. Abraham Halkin who is a member of the TI Staff. He had been invited by the Editorial Board of the Reconstructionist to become a member. Before accepting the invitation, he said, he wanted to learn from me more about the policies of the Reconstructionist. I asked him to come into my office and we had a long discussion in Hebrew on what, to my great surprise, I learned was to him the part in my philosophy he found it difficulty to accept, namely the God idea. Having long ago given up the traditional conception of God, he has not been able to achieve any other conception. His observances of religious customs and attendance at synagogue are basically part of his self-expression as a Jewish nationalist and prompted by a vague sentimental attachment which he is unable and does not care to intellectualize. This started me arguing along the same lines I do in the class especially with students of the Graduate School for Jewish Social Work. I wonder whether I shall succeed in getting Halkin ever to accept my approach to the problem of religion.

5. The interview with Adler, which was the main reason for my coming to the Seminary building, was formal and factual. He asked me to send him a record of my suggestion, since, as he said, one doesn't know what may happen to one (apparently that thought is in his mind) there should be no question as the decision arrived at.

6. Even on my way home I managed to attend to a matter of

business. I met Corici and explained to him why I had not given him the forthcoming "Reconstructionist Papers." I also found out from him what should be done with the Digest of "Judaism as a Civilization" which Ira has practically completed.

* * *

Thursday, July 2, 1936

Last Tuesday (June 30) Alexander Dushkin, who had recently returned from Jerusalem came to see me. He said that my name had been suggested for the chair in philosophy of Jewish education at the Hebrew University, and that he was authorized to ask me whether I would consider accepting the position. It seems that both Magnes and Kligler were the ones who authorized Dushkin to put that question to me.

In spite of the numerous misgivings that at once came to my mind, I answered with an unqualified affirmative.

*

One of my favorite targets of attack is the dictum (p.96) היה לי היה באמת קשה בהתחלה I was therefore taken off my feet when I came across the following by Klatzkin: כי לא יעלה על דעתם של הקוראים שהמחבר, בהיותו מתנגד גמור לכל הרעיונות שהוא מביע בספרו, בהשתוממו ומצטער על כל עמוד ועמוד שהוא כותב, יתפלל לבן הוא חוזר על הדברים. ועל כן נרגיש לנכון להעיר על כך מראש. בדרך כלל אין אנו נוהגים להתפלל לבל יחזור על דבריו מי שהוא לפנינו, אבל כאן הדבר שונה. כשאנו מתבוננים בדברי הסופר הנכבד הזה, אנו מרגישים בעליל כי הוא מצטער מאד על כך שהוא נאלץ להביע את הדברים הללו, ומרגיש הוא שהוא חייב לעשות זאת. הוא מצטער מאד על כך שהוא נאלץ לעמוד מנגד ולראות את הנעשה בעמו, ולא יוכל לעשות דבר כדי להושיע את עמו. ולכן הוא מתפלל שלא יחזיקו אותו לאחראי לדברים הללו, שהוא נאלץ להגיד בעל כרחו.

* * *

Wednesday, July 8, 1936

Another happy event in the family. My Selma, who has been keeping company with Saul Jaffe for the last five or six years, will be married to him a week from next Friday. God bless them.

B. Rivkin, a Yiddish writer, who a few years ago walked into my study unannounced on a summer day and made a deep impression upon me by reason of his interest in religion from the standpoint of a radical, reappeared again in the same fashion a few weeks ago. I have engaged him to translate my first volume into Yiddish, because I would like to reach the Yiddish speaking masses. Perhaps they will respond to my appeal to reconstruct Judaism on modern lines. So far as I am aware, there are among them more intellectuals whose ideas practically coincide with mine than among the non-Yiddish elements. All that they need is a program like the one I have formulated. I have not come across either among the religionists or Hebraists such creative thinking in the problem of Judaism as I have found in Zhittowski's writings and lately in William Natanson's; and from what I gather there must be quite a wealth of material in Steinberg's writings.

Through Rivkin I have become acquainted with Aba Gordon and William Natanson. The latter lives in Chicago. He told me about a certain Mr. Babinsky who is very much interested in my first book. Incidentally, he complained about Solomon Goldman, whose sincerity he questioned and whose lack of interest in religion he resented.

* * *

Monday, July 13, 1936

The main difficulty in effecting the transition from the anthropomorphic to a rational conception of God could be overcome, it seems to me, by the following approach: accustom yourself to the thought that the reality of God cannot be grasped by any effort at visualization. Without in any way inferring that godhood is a force in the same sense that electricity is a force, resort to the analogy of electricity. The reality of electricity is not experienced by any of the five senses. An electric shock is experienced by the muscle nerves. Likewise the reality of godhood is experienced not by any of the physical

senses but by the mind in its emotional functioning. When you are happy to the point of gratitude, or when you react to anything with a genuine feeling of holiness, you are actually experiencing God in the same sense as a feeling of shock is evidence of your contact with electricity. The fallacy which has to be unlearned - an unlearning in which he analogy to electricy may be of help - is that any experience of God must, like the experience of our neighbor's presence, apprehend Him in his entirety. This is where anthropomorphism throws one off the track. Habituate yourself to the idea that it is no more possible to be aware of the whole of God in any single experience than it is to sense all of electricity in a single shock. The fallacy of identifying any one experience or even cluster of experiences as the revelation of Deity in His fullness gives rise to idolatry.

* * *

Monday, July 20, 1936

I am working at present on "The Meaning of God in Modern Jewish Religion." I find that I have to rewrite some of the material almost entirely, but the effort is worthwhile. Just now I am rewriting the chapter on Shemini Azeret. The significance which I am now ascribing oto it is that it stresses the importance of fostering worship or communion with God. This significance requires emphasis nowadays so that God be not merely held in the mind as an idea but felt as a presence.

* * *

Wednesday, August 12, 1936

I find it extremely difficult to set down in writing the dark thoughts that flit across my mind. When I read what is happening to the Jews in Palestine and in Europe I feel as though I were in the midst of a cyclone or an earthquake. The phrase (p.98) keeps on thundering in my mind. All summer I have stayed in the city for the

purpose of working on the edition of the Jewish Reconstructionist Papers and on my own book "The Meaning of God" etc. All that work is predicated on there being some ground for the hope that a better time is coming, that the ideals of justice, freedom and peace will some day be realized, that our own Jewish people will live on a footing of equality with the rest of the world. Instead, reaction and violence are becoming more strongly entrenched than ever, and the Jewish people is confronted with the menace of gradual extermination accompanied by mental and physical torture.

* * *

Saturday, August 22, 1936

(p. 98 through page 172 (Thursday, September 22, 1938) is completely written in Hebrew)

* * *

Saturday, October 1, 1938

Today is the Sabbath of Repentance, or literally of returning, returning to reality, to the living source of one's being an inspiration. To feel the need for such return as a genuine experience one need only think of Jeremiah's striking simile: (p.173)

Whatever enables one to live out fully, naturally and creatively one's best self is a "fountain of living waters." Whatever binds, hampers and obstructs the career of one's best self is a "broken cistern," a more than superfluous artificiality, which human beings are in the habit of needlessly imposing upon themselves. All such artificialities as we adopt or submit to for the sake of vanity or applause or to gratify some other petty desire, are essentially the idolatries which all genuine human beings - thinkers who thought their own thoughts and prophets who voiced their own and not the mob's courage - have always denounced.

For more than two years I have been struggling to master the Hebrew language so that I could express myself in it with ease and naturalness, and all to no purpose. Of course this inability is mainly due to my own shortcoming; the lack of word-and-name-memory. That shortcoming becomes particularly painful when the language itself is lacking those very terms in which most of my thoughts are in the habit of becoming articulate. A language that prevents me from expressing the difference between mind and spirit and makes me use (p.173) for both, or the difference between culture and civilization, a language in which I have no word for "efficient," "effective," "attitude," and hundreds of other such terms, is neither a means of revealing or concealing thought, but just strangling it. And whatever strangles my thought strangles me.

For the sake of identifying myself with the only vital fragment of my people - the Hebrew speaking group - and in order to acquire the ability of functioning among them I have been doing all in my power to write and speak in Hebrew, as witness the work I put into translating more than half of ~~Dewey's~~ Nona-Dewey's "Democratic Philosophy of Education," the lectures on the History of Education and the outline of the Principles of Education, and in spite of all that effort I am continually laboring under a handicap. Emotionally I find it hard to admit failure and unhappiness in my struggle to attain full comand of Hebrew, but my reason tells me that I should not permit these considerations to stand in the way of that fuller and freer thought life, of that wellspring of expression which the English language places at my disposal. Hence my act of "Teshubah" of returning to the use of it in this Journal, which has come to be an indispensable outlet for so many ideas which I have no one to communicate to, but which to me seem too significant to be allowed to dissolve like tobacco smoke rings. What I am doing now is probably the oddest kind of repentance ever practiced in the history

of religion, but nothing should surprise or shock anyone these days with the world all awry.

What made me write the foregoing was the fact that when I woke up this morning at 6:00 an idea came to my mind, about the succession of civilizations, with such force that if I belonged to the ancient universe of discourse I would have regarded it as a revelation from some deity, or at least the suggestion of some divine mentor. Knowing how little capable I would be to express in Hebrew that idea in all its far reaching implications, I decided upon resuming to keep this Journal henceforth in English. In the meantime, with the interruption of breakfast, conversation with Lena and attendance at services, the very thing I speak of before as happening to my ideas that are not recorded immediately is what actually occurred to the thought that came to my mind early this morning. It has almost dissolved.

Let me, however, make an attempt at recapturing it. In working a few months ago on the history of Christian education, I put to myself the question: Why was it possible for Mohammedanism to attain such brilliant achievements culturally during the eighth to the thirteenth centuries, in contrast to Christianity which by itself would never have gotten beyond the stage of the Cathedral schools? This question led to my noting the striking parallel between the attitude of the early Christians to the Graeco-Roman civilization and that of the Communists toward bourgeois civilization. Early Christianity represented the protest of the victims of Graeco-Roman civilization against an order of life that crushed their bodies and their spirits. In their wrath against that order of life they were determined to leave no vestige of it and to institute a new way of life - that based upon otherworldliness. In the end such an attempt was bound to come to grief. People have to live in and make the most of this world. The

early Christians took otherworldliness much more literally than the Jews and Mohammedans and therefore made no provisions for living in this world - which in their case meant that they had no divinely revealed law. It was only as a grudging concession and in complete inconsistency with its original premises that Christianity had to accept first Roman law, later Greek philosophy and finally during the Renaissance, Graeco-Roman literature to enable its adherents to satisfy their normal social and intellectual needs. The case with Mohammedanism was radically different. It was not the outcome of protest against a dominant and tyrannous civilization. It was basically the awakening of the Arab hordes to a sense of unity and desire for conquest. As the civilization of a conquering people, it had nothing to fear from the civilization of the peoples it conquered, and therefore adopted freely the science and philosophy of the Greeks, which in some instances it carried to still further developments. This led me to an interesting generalization, if true, that it is a conquered or oppressed people that is apt to be exclusive. A dominant group can afford to assimilate the best of what comes its way without fear of losing its identity.

There however remained one loose thread in the argument. I could not account for the fact that the great cultural lustre of Mohammedan civilization should have dimmed so suddenly. The explanation that is usually given is that the inner disorganization and the invasion of the Turks were responsible for this decline did not altogether satisfy me. After all the invaders themselves became Mohammedanized.

It was apropos of this question that the idea which I am trying to recapture came to my mind, although the idea itself does not refer to it directly. It has to do with the general nature of civilizations. That nature it seems to me is most accurately reflected in the type of sanctions whereby the individual comes to act otherwise

than his impulses prompt him, not because he is physically compelled to do so, but because of some inner compulsion. A civilization in which spirits or divine ancestors are the sources of such sanctions is inherently different from one in which clearly conceived national deities serve that function. The latter again cannot be compared to civilizations in which the point of reference in these sanctions is a single deity who is declared to be the only God. Another type, and one into which the previous types may develop, is one in which a divinely revealed law is the basis of sanctions.

Now at last I come to the specific thought which has been the occasion of all that ado about repentance. It occurred to me that it is about time we should have an eye not merely for political and economic but also for cultural revolutions. I mean actually revolutions which are purposely willed and knowingly achieved. Such a cultural revolution was that affected by the Israelites or Jews in Palestine when they destroyed canaanite civilization, or at least they thought they did. In reality they only destroyed the sanctions or the soul of canaanite civilization, not its substance when they had Yahweh take the place of the baalim. But during the Second Commonwealth period Yahweh - who had become the sole God and Creator could not serve as source of sanction unless He formulated His will in an eternal Torah. What really happened was that many of the Canaanite practices became Yahweized.

A new type of civilization arose - or rather Judaism developed into a new type of civilization - when the Jews came in contact with Syro-Greek civilization. The latter was - insofar as it was Greek - essentially humanistic and this-worldly in a utilitarian and sensualistic sense. Since such contact spelt hostility and danger, Jewish civilization in wishing to offset the Syro-Greek menace began to evolve the negation of the humanistic and this-worldly to a point where it soon

became other-worldly. Nevertheless it still had its Torah that bound it to rules dealing with earthly needs. This prevented its other-worldliness from becoming full-fledged.

The case was otherwise with Christianity as soon as Paul rendered it accessible to the pagan world. He deprived it of the Torah and made it into the deliberate antithesis of Graeco-Roman civilization which he and his followers regarded as the incarnation of sin. Hence it became altogether otherworldly, with the consequence that it found itself empty of cultural content, and had to admit into its framework something of the Graeco-Roman civilization in order to meet the practical needs of its followers.

Quite different is the background of Islam. Mohammed found himself in a position analogous to that in which were those in Israel - priests as well as prophets - who in order to create a spirit of unity in Israel formulated the Torah as the antithesis of Canaanite civilization. Mohammed therefore felt impelled to give a Torah to his followers as a means both of rallying them and of combating the polytheistic heathenism of the Arab tribes. The Koran is the basis of a this-worldly civilization which is the antithesis of polytheistic this-worldly culture, just as the Jewish Torah was as first. In this stage of its development, it could well afford to assimilate Greek science and philosophy, just as Judaism in this Torah stage could afford to assimilate many elements of Persian and Egyptian culture or religion without fear of impugning its individuality. But further contact with Greco-Roman culture and the stiffening of European resistance to its onward career as well as the other-worldly character of Christianity itself contributed to the accentuation of the other-worldly element in Mohammedanism and above all to the intensification of inherent Muslim law and type of thought. This I believe was the spirit in which the Almohades introduced into Mohammedan Spain and contributed to the cultural setback of Islam.

Europeanism which begins to assert itself in the 13th century represents, I believe, the civilization of the bourgeois type that is apparently a characteristic product of European topography and historic evolution of the races that inhabit it. This identification of the bourgeois type as the creator of modern capitalism, is, I ~~think~~ imagine, the main point in Sombart's writings. Those who were to develop this civilization came in contact with a disintegrating Roman empire that adopted Christianity as a means of checking that disintegration. They became Christian as a means of becoming Roman, but got nothing from Christianity in the way of guidance and content in their social and intellectual life. At first to be sure the high officials of the Church helped to stem the anarchy that threatened when the civil administration of Rome broke down. But the Church as such had nothing to offer these peoples other than a catechism and a few hymns. As soon as they were in a condition to want more they turned to the old Greco-Roman civilization. Thus arose the Universities and later the Revival of Learning. Since it was not feasible to restore Pagan Rome, the Church became quite pagan. This paradox could not continue for long. While this paradox existed, the limited number who lived in accordance with it, adopted a new sanction of the civilization they were vaguely groping for. That sanction was the reason of the individual as against the authority of the Church. But the reason of the individual could not long maintain itself as a sanction of conduct in which we function as social beings. That sanction must derive from some form of group life, which provides at the same time the content of the civilization by which one lives. With the Church failing to come up to that requirement, nationalism began to assert itself. From that time on, individual reason served no longer as the basis of the sanction for conduct, but as the liberator from the Church and its tradition, and therefore, as a preparation for nationalism.

With the progress of technology, bourgeois civilization or capitalism exploited nationalism to overthrow the feudal system. But the same progress of technology has developed in the masses, whom it has rendered prolific, an awareness that they too are entitled to some of the advantages of civilized existence. They have gradually begun to rebel against being explited by the bourgeois. Along came Marx and gave them a purpose and a philosophy which some of them are beginning to understand. In its first successful revolution the Russian proletariat proceeded to overthrow not only the capitalist economy, but the whole capitalist civilization or way of life. Communism in Russia set out to evolve a new civilization.

What is to be the nature of the source of sanctions of this communist civilization? Human reason not in the renaissance sense of individual confrontation of the world, but as a cooperative human enterprise. But can we be sure that we have in human reason as a cooperative human enterprise a guarantee of the millenium? What is actually happening in Russia is enough to make us pause.

But there is another manifestation of reason as a cooperative human enterprise that is actually frightening. Nazism or Fascism is inherently as much of a protest both against the Church and against capitalism and bourgeois civilization as communism. It too is a repudiation of other-worldliness. It too is the protest of the masses against exploitation by the few. Apparently we need to be more specific as to what we shall identify as reason, if we want it to serve as a source of sanctions for a livable world. We cannot afford to consider reason a cooperative human enterprise unless human is made coextensive with humanity. Any delineation of reason to a particular nation, race or class destroys its essential character. Hence the only kind of civilization which is compatible with human life henceforth is one that derives its sanctions from reason as the collective enter-

prise of humanity. To bring about the functioning of such reason the unity of mankind must be implemented by social, political and economic arrangements, which will preclude the possibility of war.

In the meantime the world is in a fine stew! Men, women and children by the thousand are being sacrificed to the Moloch of war in China and in Spain and during the last week millions were on the edge of horrible disaster that could have been brought on by the word of an insane fanatic. O what a week of universal fear and anguish! And now that the fright of immediate extinction is over, how do we feel? I might say that we feel like a person who has a violent hemorhage and thinks he is dying, but manages to survive it only to learn that he is consumptive. With Hitler triumphant and winning for Germany the Great World War twenty years after it had been badly defeated, without losing a single soldier, the cause of Fascism and Nazism will make rapid strides in the world. With the democracies still dominantly capitalist and church-ridden - which means narrowly nationalist in their way and with Fascism and Nazism fostering militant race nationalism, mankind is in for a long period of muddleheadedness, blundering and internal dissension among the former, and of brutality, suppression and violence among the latter. In the midst of it all I cannot see even a ray of hope for our own poor Jewish people. Realizing so clearly as I do what ought to be and what might be, and seeing nothing ever augmenting cruelty and humanly inflicted misery piling up mountain high and blocking the road to its fulfillment, I am finding it almost impossible to give to others that guidance and inspiration which they expect of me.

I am quite certain that if I had attempted to write up all of the foregoing in Hebrew, I would have become too exhausted with the effort and would not have gotten very far with what I wanted to say. Would anything have been lost? Not as far as the world is concerned. It doesn't give a hoot about the such like of me. But I certainly would have felt frustrated, God knows I feel sufficiently frustrated as it is. Why add to that feeling, if there is a way of preventing it. I certainly feel better now that all of the above is off my chest, and I can proceed with my plodding on the history and meaning of education.

* * *

Sunday, October 2, 1938

It is only in a world in which reason as the collective enterprise of humanity is the source of sanctions for human conduct, it is only in a warless world that a solution is possible to the apparent autonomy of law and freedom, authority and individual self-expression. For the main danger at presentinherent in freedom and individual self-expression is that it is bound to break up the unity of the group, and render it defenseless to attack from without. In a world of international war, each nation must insist upon the solidarity of its citizens, or else it is bound to be enslaved by any other nation which is more successful in maintaining that solidarity. This necessarily involves the suppression of any idea or ideal that might have a divisive influence. Hence individual freedom must be sacrificed to what is regarded as the good of the nation. All this danger to a people from individual self-expression would disappear with the establishment of international peace. It is strange that in all the insistence upon the freedom of the individual, one does not meet any sign of recognition that it is bound up integrally with the unity of mankind.

For once I find in the Torah a real solacing thought in these ominous days. I refer to the legend of Noah as the only righteous man in an age of universal violence. That legend indicates the hope upon which it is possible to fall back nowadays, namely, the few outstanding personalities who stand out like towering mountains above the ranging floods of hatred, cruelty and despair. Men of the type of Ghandi, Romain Rolland, Thomas Mann, and many others do still help to give a sense of reality to the idea of God. They are the representatives of those aspects of life, I have habituated myself to associate with the belief in God. If I had the energy, I would apply myself to the task of expounding this thought in a book. It might be a good idea to deliver a series of lectures on these men when I get back to the States, and then put those lectures out in book form.

The entire idea came to my mind as a result of a letter by Bendetto Croce, which appeared in this morning's Palestine Post, and in which he condemns ~~the~~ Italy's ~~persecu~~ persecution of the Jews. Evidently he too belongs to the (p.180) חסידי אומות העולם. This ought to make an excellent title in Hebrew, and might lead to the use of it as a text in the school.

Apropos of the foregoing is a passage I have just come across in R. H. Quick's "Essays on Educational Reformers (p.317). In discussing Pestalozzi's success in Stanz in producing a marvellous physical, intellectual and moral change in the orphans committed to his care, Quick quotes Michelet as saying the following: "If ever there was a miracle, it was here. It was the reward of a strong faith, of a wonderful expansion of heart. He believed, he willed, he succeeded." He then adds the following:

"What was the great act of faith by which P. triumphed? According to M. Michelet he stood before these vicious and degraded

children and said 'Man is good!' P. does not tell us this himself; and as a benighted believer in Christianity, I venture to differ from the enlightened Michelet. As far as I can judge from P's own teaching the source of his strength was in his belief in the goodness not of Man but of God."

I agree with P. Whatever strength I derive for the goodness of those I mentioned above, I do not derive from their goodness as an isolated and complete fact by itself. Indeed, if I were to view their goodness only in that way, I would tend to be disheartened rather than encouraged. It is because I regard their goodness as a revelation of something inherent in the very nature of reality, and as the promise of a universal state of human affairs that it is a source of strength to me. This is why I believe that Pestalozzi is right.

When any one of the ancients or primitives became aware of an idea entering his mind - note incidentally the very phrase, entering his mind - he was certain that some superhuman being, god or spirit, sent that idea to him. This, I believe, accounts for the ascription by the prophets and lawgivers in the Bible, of their pronouncements to Yahweh. Strange as it may seem, this pre-scientific notion of an idea as not the product of one's own mind seems to have much in common with that ultra-scientific notion of the behaviorists that there is no mind or ego that does any thinking and that instead of saying "I think" we should say "it thinks in me."

"Minds that are still childish" says C. G. Jung (Wotan, Neue Schweitzer Rundschan, March 1936 translated by B. Harrah in Saturday Review Oct. 1937) think of gods as existing in one of two says. Either the gods are metaphysical entia, or else they are inventions playful or superstitious as the case may be." What are they to

Jung himself? "They are personificati ns of physical force." What then is God. Jung would say there is no god other than one of those personifications. With this I take definite issue. These psychical forces are those generated by group life and activity. Gods are necessarily national. But God represents other psychical forces than those which find expression in the national being. There are psychical forces that give rise to reason and justice just as there are those that give rise to passion and frenzy. Of the former it can be said that they come nearer to representing the essence of reality than of the latter, if by essence we mean the direction in which reality is moving. It is those psychical forces that constitute God.

In that article from which the foregoing by Jung is quoted there is a remarkable passage about the Germans which is very much to the point these days. "We who stand on the outside judge the contemporary German far too much on the theory that he is a responsible active agent. It would be much more sensible to regard him as a person who suffers. Something very powerful has hit Germany, and it is only they who suffer themselves who gratuitously inflict pain."

* * *

Monday, October 3, 1938

With the Tel Aviv Jerusalem road being of late frequently subjected to attacks by brigands, telephone connection severed and travelers shot at, my heart was in my mouth when Naomi left yesterday morning for Tel Aviv on her way to Beirut. But thank G. she arrived safely. Another load off my mind.

As a result of my reading Kropotkin's "Mutual Aid," it occurred to me that a lot of unnecessary cogitation was wasted by the philosophers on the question of the basis of the sense of obligation

or duty, and that all that mental gymnastics about the categorical imperative is balderash. If Kropotkin's thesis that cooperation or mutual aid is a biological fact like the sex urge - and I can see no reason for disbelieving it - the urge to help one's fellows is bound to be just as imperative and as the sex urge. It is a wonder that Kant didn't formulate a categorical imperative to perform the sex act without enjoying it. The Talmud in that respect was more consistent. It does speak of coitus as being performed (p.182)

I believe that I have arrived at last at a really workable definition of education which strikes me as being far superior to the one I arrived at some time ago (see p. 126) in being very much more seminal. I better quote it in Hebrew, because I have not yet formulated it in English. Here it is: (p. 182)

Except for the first three chapters of the proposed book on "The New Approach to Education," which discusses the foregoing definition is a summary of that book. What a wonderful thing it would be if one didn't have to spend time and effort on elaboration of ideas and could get a hearing for them when stated in the concentrated form of a definition. Someone ought to put out a sort of miniature magazine in which whole articles would be given in a single sentence, or at most in a single paragraph of about four or five sentences.

* * *

Thursday, Octover 6, 1938

Lena and I attended services of the (p.182) which is a congregation which was organized by its present rabbi, Dr. Kurt Wilhelm, and which has been in existence now about two and a half years. Wilhelm was a student at the Seminary to which he came as a Ph.D. and from which he was graduated in 1925. He went back to Germany where he became district rabbi at Braunschweig (I believe). With the advent of Hitler, he came to Palestine. At first he did some youth work for the Zionist organization, but later went back to rabbinic work. It appears that he principal helper here has been Kalvarisky and his son-in-law Simon, Kalvarisky himself had attempted to make some changes in the services while he lived at Rosh Pinah - more, as he says, to meet the need of his grandchildren than his own, since he had become disinterested in worship - but when Rosh Pinah got itself a Rav all those changes were eliminated. Now that Kalvarisky lives in Jerusalem he responded to Wilhelm's request for assistance, which may have been prompted by his son-in-law Simon who is a German and comes from pious parentage. All the others whom Wilhelm succeeded in enlisting in his group are German Jews. Their number, however, is so far too small to enable Wilhelm to make a living. So he turned for assistance to the Union of Progressive Jews in England, on the ground that he was helping to introduce Progressive Judaism here. When I attended his services last year, which he held at Ben Yehudah Str. not far from the Zion Cinema House and found that the only reform he had introduced was to have the reader of the Torah face the congregation instead of having his back to it, I asked Wilhelm, wherein his Judaism was progressive. He replied that so long as he was dependent upon weddings and funerals for earning some income he could not afford to antagonize the rabbinate here by making any signfficant changes. As it is he is suspect because he has not put up a partition between the men worshippers and the women worshippers.

The high holiday services were held in the new hall built on the Bezalel premises. I attended them only on the first day of Rosh Hashanah. On Yom Kippur I was present throughout. I cannot say that there was even one moment in the total of fourteen or fifteen hours that I did not feel bored - to say nothing of being actually inspired. Wilhelm's sermons had only one merit - they were not too long. Otherwise they had as much sense as the piyelt. There is no use of repeating what I think of the prayers and the Torah-reading. All in all the high holidays which even Jews here still seem to honor in the observance by means of synagogue attendance are a tragic waste of a golden opportunity to fructify the Jewish mind and spirit. If Jews, e.g. would make it a point to call upon their poets and prose writers to write special hymns and prose pieces for the services what a wealth of thought and emotion might not be elicited. It's the old story of stupidity against which even the gods contend in vain.

In the meantime services seem doomed. Of course they will probably hang on for another half century, just as have the Indians and civil war veterans and horses and hurdy-gurdys but they are a dying institution. At least so it seems, unless by some miracle people will acquire a different set of thought-habits. Only a few days ago we got a letter from Judith in which she refers to a conversation that Ira had with Edward Warburg, the late F. D. Warburg's son, who is apparently trying to continue some of his father's public endeavors. In that conversation young Warburg said that religious services were as doomed as is the opera. For the last fifty years attempts have been made to revitalize opera, but without effect. The few who care for it want the "old horses" only, and most people are bored by the old stuff And this morning I heard a similarly negative opinion about the future of religious services. Lena and I were taking our usual morning walk when we met Prof. Roth of the University here. We naturally fell to

discussing the services in our respective synagogues, his being Jeshurim. After expressing his disgust with the Chief Rabbi Herzog's meaningless farrago on Kol Nidre night, he alluded to the boring character of the prayers. In all these evaluations, he was speaking not for himself but for his youngster who is about 12, I believe. Lena then threw in a word about my having been asked by Mrs. E. Yellin to organize children's services. "and why," said she, "couldn't we actually have special services for children?" He at once scouted the idea of his having anything to do with the organization of services of any kind because, as he added, he personally doesn't believe in services, and only attends them to keep up a family tradition. With this coming from a scholarly Jew who just published a (p.184) [illegible] I see but little chance of the old religious order surviving even here for long.

* * *

Monday, October 10, 1938

Last Friday was a day of tension. Most of the people in our neighborhood were without water all day. Rumor had it that the brigands smashed the water pipes somewhere near Lydda. Finally tonight at 9:30 the watter supply was resumed and we were glad that that worry was off our minds. Before five minutes passed we heard machine gun firing which came from somewhere nearby. We were warned by the military officer downstairs not to step out on the balcony because some of the bullets were richcheting in these parts. Later we learned that many bullets were found a few blocks away from where we live, some even on King George Road.

* * *

Thursday, October 13, 1938

I never feel so frustrated as when I know I have gotten hold of a seminal idea and find myself unable to body it forth with the aid of sufficient examples and illustrations so as to render it truly telling.

Just now it is the idea that one of the most important needs to be reckoned with in education is how to emply the surplus energy that is not used up in the discharge of our calling. That energy is properly utilized finds expression in that aspect of human life which formerly people were in the habit of identifying as the human differentia, and which nowadays we describe as creative. Educationally it appears, that the creative possibilities inherent in this energy, which have so far received attention are the esthetic. To this I should like to add the necessary emphasis on the intellectual and the executive possibilities. I have been at a loss to find material for the point I want to make. I made a try at Hughes Mearns' book on "Creative Power," though it seems to deal mainly with creative writing. The book has shaken me to my depths, through its revelation of the great powers that are dormant in children. I see, though, no point in Mearns' deprecating the contention that it take extfaordinarily gifted teachers to evoke that power. The very example he cites in deprecation of that contention only goes to confirm it. (see pp. 80 sq., see also p. 104) I too was moved to tears by "A Hymn of Thanksgiving," the work of third grade children. Ib my humble judgment it outclasses by far the 148th psalm.

Just as I was transported into an exalted mood by the entire spirit of the book I was brought down to earth with a shock by two cablegrams from America, one from the SAJ and one from the children urging us to come back as speedily as possible in view of "present and expected conditions." This time we could talk things over with the Dushkins who arrived last Tuesday and by now the shock has worn off. Or rather, it was just about to wear off when lo and behold Abdullah the house janitor, came to warn us not to be too free with the water since the supply is likely to stop soon altogether. It seems that some important personage of the Mufti's entourage has been done away with today and reprisals are feared.

We just replied to the cables saying "Why alarmed now? Conditions no worse."

I was going to add "Mufti ready to receive Chamberlain at Beirut if willing to sign on dotted line" but Lena was afraid people in America might come to believe that I had actually gone "nuts" as a result of conditions here, so my humor did not come off.

Mearns' book on Creative Education is replete with wisdom and inspiration. I find e.g. great comfort in the following: "What we are is not of our own making; the myriad forces of life are acting upon us everlastingly, and we cannot deny our centuries of inheritance. It is not what we are, but what we do with ourselves that counts. And we should never be afraid to confront what we really are, but fear only self-deception. To know is to be on guard."

But there is nonsense too in Mearns' book as when e.g. he writes blithely in disregard of reality as follows: "...many will not think that any of our fine distinctions are important. But it is just through the attention to distinctions of the sort we are recording here that humanity has made its progress. We used to duck poor old trembling women and beat the terrified feeble-minded." (p. 106) I could not help commenting in the margin: This is a delusion. Neither Dante nor Shakespeare had anything to do with our giving up that habit. There's plenty of fine creative writing in your bibles; yet it had as much effect on stopping our cruel practices as zephyrs have on a pack of apes in a jungle.

That's just the trouble with these creative folk. They can't be satisfied with the homage which every normal person is only too ready to render them, but they must step on the uncreative multitude to prove them nothing but dirt. On the same page as the one in which the above quotation occurs is a paragraph which is a fine illustration

of inverted Pharisaism (yes Pharisaism, Herford, Schecter, Finkelstein et al to the contrary notwithstanding).

"Not to try! (is one of the ways of succeeding in the creative field) How the creative life fights all the precepts of the virtuous ones! The good little boy is one who gets up at an exact hour, does always what he is told, listens to others and disregards any promptings of thinking that might suggest themselves from within, strives all the time to do his best, never loafs, eats his meals on time, including 200 calories of spinahc, never speaks unless spoken to, assumes an interest in everything worthy, prepares all his lessons with exactly equal interest in each and goes to bed on the dot without a single original human whine."

This is nothing but a silly caricature of a little boy that never was. It's only effect is to pound in a sense of inferiority into us uncreative creatures, as though we didn't feel inferior enough without all this literary snobbery being spent on us.

* * *

Saturday night, Oct. 15, 1938

When you are cudgelling your brain to formulate the general principles underlying a vocational education, it's annoying, to say the least, to have your thoughts punctuated by shots, which not even the raucous phonograph upstairs succeeds in drowning.

* * *

Thursday, Oct. 20, 1938

It now appears that the shooting I heard Saturday night marked the entry of about 600 bandits - or rebels - into the Old City. They took possession of it and tried to displace the British police and military. For about four days there was continuous firing. The nights especially were rendered hideous and nerve wracking. Yesterday English troops in large numbers finally entered the old town and appear to have

gotten the situation somewhat in hand. That was yesterday morning. They went about this as though they were reenacting Allenby's entry into Jerusalem. An aeroplane kept on flying up and down the place and throwing down leaflets warning everybody watching and outside the old town not to come out of their houses. Very few people in the municipal area took the warning seriously. Not knowing about it myself, I proceeded with my daily morning stroll on the roof.

I discovered the roof only about two months ago when fear of Arab reprisals led me to avoid walking even on King George and Ben Jehudah Streets. Since then I have found it more enjoyable to take my morning constitutional there instead of walking over the same uninteresting territory day in and day out. On the roof I can at least carry on my thinking - something I cannot do when I walk in the street.

* * *

Saturday night, October 22, 1938

Again we were without water for about 40 hours. There were all kinds of rumors to account for the stoppage, but no one seemed to know anything definite.

I have been suffering all week from acid stomach. It probably is due to my being under a nervous strain which may easily be accounted for in my case, since hardly a moment in the day do I forget the tragic plight of our people throughout the world. It is not necessary nowadays to be a "Hasid" to carry out Hayyim Luzzatto's advice to those who would achieve ?(p.187) saintliness "to be sorely distressed over Israel's dispersion and desolution" Mesh p. 177).

* * *

Wednesday, November 2, 1938

When Dushkin returned from America on Oct. 10 he told me that he had been approached by Judge Rosenman and other members of his group about accepting the executive directorship of the Friedsam Fund.

The Sunday before Dushkin's arrival Magnes telephoned to me that he had received a letter from Lowenstein (Executive director superintendent of Federation) urging him to persuade Dushkin to accept the post with the Friedsam fund. A few days after that Hexter (who is now associated with Lowenstein) sent a cable to Fassman (an American Zionist who has settled here) asking him to find out from Dushkin whether he is considering the acceptance of the post offered him.

On Monday, Oct. 24 Magnes, Dushkin and I met in Magnes' office on top of the Wolfsohn Building (Library) to discuss the matter, after Magnes and Dushkin had discussed the matter a few days before by themselves. It was in this latter conversation that Magnes made the suggestion that he would be willing to come to America, if it could be arranged that he should campaign for Jewish education there. In the meantime he would use that opportunity to develop a financial backing for the University. This suggestion of Magnes' gave Dushkin new impetus to consider seriously the offer made to him. Weighing on the one hand the difficulties in developing the pedagogic department in the University both from a financial and administrative point of view and on the other the possibilities of bringing new life into the Jewish situation in New York with the aid of Magnes' active campaigning and with over a million dollar fund to work with, Dushkin came to view very favorably the N.Y. offer, which he was at first inclined to turn down. He also looked upon my return at this time as an asset.

When the three of us met on Monday, Oct. 24, Magnes said that he could not bind himself to an undertaking that would have to go into effect in a year from now. Thereupon I suggested that Dushkin and I arrange to conclude our courses here by the middle of March and that we then leave for New York. Magnes took up the suggestion at once. On the basis of it he sent a long telegram, offering to help in the campaign, and mentioning the possibility of our (his, Dushkin and my) starting on the work this next spring. So far there has been no reply.

This morning the Senate held its first meeting of the new academic year. Prof. Fraenkel was elected Rector. He got 16 votes against 10 of Roth's. Strangely my name was put up for candidacy, but I immediately refused. Prof. Adler (of leprosy germ fame) afterwards asked me why I refused to run.

* * *

Friday, November 4, 1938

I thought that having resumed the use of English in this journal I would have so much to write that before long I would have to order a new blank volume. But somehow I am still subject to inner language conflict which has an inhibiting effect. It is not a conflict of principles but of habits. Being bent upon acquiring the habit of using Hebrew with ease, I am afraid that every time I use English I am preventing that habit from being formed. And such is life -- a series of choices, with discontent as a result, but of fear that one is always missing something, whichever way one decides.

Another reason for my not having made any entries is no doubt the fact that I was bent upon completing my outline of the Principles of Education beforestarting the academic year next week. I feel satisfied with the greater part of the outline, although I had to work quite hard on a few of the themes. I am glad that I was forced to formulate what may be called a militant ideology for democracy. I have always felt that Dewey's conception as developed in his book as Democracy and Education is entirely inadequate. But I never got to putting down just what democracy should mean. As I have now formulated it I feel that we Jews have something to unite on with all the liberal forces of the world, and that all people whom the success of Fascism and Nazism has rendered disgusted with mankind can have something really worthwhile to live for and fight for.

I was very much stirred by Hans Kohn's "Force or Reason" which I read about a week ago. It made me ashamed of myself for having thought so highly of Spengler's "Decline of the West" when I read it a few years ago, although of course there were many things in that book that I violently resented even then. The point is that, say what you will, there is an allure to totalitarianism that is hard to resist. The same is true of Nietzsche's critique of moralism. How overwhelming he must have been with his "Umwertung aller Werete" may be seen from the fact that not only did it bowl over some of our Jewish writers but also that the only way Ahad Ha-Am could set them up again was by pointing out that Nietzsche had been anticipated by Judaism with its doctrine of (p.189) especially as interpreted in the Talmud and the saying .

I heard Dr. Yasky at the Dushkins tonight tell this story of an actual letter that he had seen written by a German Jew, who had to leave Germany, to one of his friends here. In that letter the German Jew asked his friend to find an apartment for him in Tel Aviv but to make sure that it was not in a Jewish quarter of the city.

* * *

Saturday, November 5, 1938

As I see it now there are to be three parts to my treatment of the principles of education: I. The existential aspect; II. The normative aspect; III. The norm.

I. The first part is to discuss the educative process as it is carried on both among sub-humans and among human beings when still unreflective. The problem is to get at the essential element or elements in that process, apart from the conscious purposes toward which that process is directed in the later stages of its development. As a process it is analogous to the political, the economic and the religious

process, each of which arises spontaneously as a manifestation of human social life. Like them it has its roots in the subhuman and like them it represents a special phase of social life, abstracted from social life as a whole for the purpose of study. So viewed it represents that phase of individual and collective self-preservation which takes place in the transaction between the older and younger generation, whereby the younger generation is enabled to survive and to continue the life of the group after the older generation has passed away. Neither this outcome nor the means to its attainment is for a long time consciously recognized by either party to the educational transaction. It is only as a result of changes which take place in social life as a whole that there is a hitch in the educative process. Since no such changes take place among the sub-humans or among humans in the primitive stages of their existence, the educative process never attains among them the degree of reflection. During all the time however that the educative process was carried on it possessed the polar aspect of helping the individual survive as long as his physical organism could possibly permit him and of rendering him qualified to aid the group to which he belonged to survive in its struggle for existence, such survival being inherently indefinite. With the changes taking place in the conditions of human life, and especially with the acceleration of those changes, as we approach in our consideration modern times, the element of conscious purpose and selection by means begins to assert itself. Among the factors which in modern times have contributed most to this element of purposive thinking, the technological resolution should be rated as probably the most prominent.

The second chapter of this first part should give a resume of the main educational reforms which characterize modern education at its best.

The third chapter should deal with the obstacles in the way of genuine reform.

II. The normative aspect opens with a formulation of what education should be, what purposes should be set up consciously and what means best calculated to attain them. Here comes the discussion of the fundamental needs in the life of the individual and of the types of social organization for which we should aim to have the individual identify himself with.

III. The norm. This represents that element which emerges as consciousness of purpose and means when the educative process as carried on is felt to be inadequate. Such consciousness passes through a long and torturous evolution. At the stage at which it has arrived now we may identify the following three elements: 1. Faith in the higher ordivine possibilities of human life. 2. Reason, which expresses itself best in the realization of dynamism and polarity, and 3. Democracy which is the application of reason to all human relationships.

* * *

Sunday, November 6, 1938

In elaborating on the importance of trying to understand education from the existential approach it is necessary to point out that it is a mistake to start with the normative approach, because in that way we simply exploit education for whatever philosophical or political ism we happen to be interested in. There is then no recognition of any objective reality to restrain such exploitation which is esentially nothing but propaganda. I surmise this is the danger underlying such philosophies of education as those of Giovanni and Krieck, the former a Fascist, the latter a Nazi. I suspect that the approach used by Gandig and Spranger fall into the same category, and to a large extent even Kerschensteiner. It begins to dawn on me that it was this constant hammering by the German educators on the idealistic

or "value" approach to education, instead of the naturalistic or biological that has conditioned German mentality for its present national monomania.

I want to make claar that by preferring the naturalistic approach I do not mean to imply that the normative is to be merely a duplication of the natural. All that I want to make sure is that the normative will not be used merely as a tool for propaganda. There is a vast difference between a norm which arises out of a knowledge of the natural reality and reckons with it and a norm which is set up regardless of any such considerations.

* * *

Wednesday, November 9, 1938

I've just heard a summary of the Partition Commission Report and the resolution of the Government, which practically reject that report as unworkable and which indicate the intention of the government to compel the Jews and Arabs to come to terms. It seems to me that the Jews have for once come off the winners, and the fears of our losing Palestine permanently appear to be dissipated at last. I hope I am not mistaken in regarding these most recent developments as the first ray of light that has penetrated the black night that envelops Jews everywhere.

This morning the opening exercises of the University took place. Magnes, Prof. Bergman and Prof. Fraenkel the new rector, spoke.

The three afternoons of this week, Sunday, Monday and Tuesday from 2:30 to 5:30, Dushkin, Brill and I interviewed about 45 students of the third and fourth year who were to enter the pedagogic department. Of them 25 go 30 seemed quite promising material.

Incidentally, I was very unfavorably impressed by the narrow range of studies pursued by the students in the University. It seems to me that these young people are allowed to go in for specialization far too soon in their intellectual development. Nor do I believe that with all their specialization they really get to the bottom of what they are studying. Their lack of breadth or general culture is probably the main reason for this shortcoming.

* * *

Friday, November 11, 1938

At long last the courses of the University were resumed yesterday, and I gave my finest lecture this year on the Principles of Education. With the candidates for the pedagogy department having been interviewed only recently and with some still to be interviewed, the class I am to have in "Principles of Ed" is not yet fully organized. Some of the twenty who were present yesterday will not be permitted to continue, while others have still to be added. For that reason I did not distribute the copies of the outline which I had ready, but instead prepared for an introductory lecture. After writing out the outline of it, I found that I had left it home, when I was about to start lecturing. Fortunately I had worked out the ideas contained in it in such logical fashion and I was so full of the central thought, that I found no difficulty in giving the lecture without the aid of the outline I had written out. Even in English this would have been quite an ordeal, since I have gotten used to having notes in front of me, whenever I lecture, and all the more in Hebrew. But fortunately I got through successfully, and the experience, now that it's over, has been fortifying.